

Vince Comments to SMBNEP PE Package

April 23, 2019

Response to 2014 Challenges

Financial Management: *To explore new funding mechanisms and opportunities.*

- SMBNEP has turned this into a strength during this review period, with almost \$90 million in total funding, including leveraged resources and fundraising. \$17.4 million came from State Bonds while TBF was granted over \$11 million from multiple sources.
- Additional resources were pursued and gained more funding from local and state municipalities, industry, other federal entities.

Outreach and Public Involvement: *Continue clarifying SMBNEP roles and responsibilities on key environmental projects and urge all partners to publicly clarify their respective roles as well.*

- Tom's resignation was an effort to reduce confusion about his dual-Director roles.
- Publication of annual reports allow for sharing of accomplishments and giving credits for which projects are led or supported by which partners.
- CCMP revision involves tackling the organizational structure, though implementation will be outside of the review period. Received funding from EPA to clarify roles of each entity and their responsibilities. Not quite fully addressed but working on this.

Continue to use the WAC meetings as the vehicle for public participation in CCMP and annual workplan implementation oversight.

- WAC was instrumental in providing input for the CCMP revision and workplan process, including identifying workplan priorities and other suggestions for consideration in CCMP Action Plan document.
- Seven seats are given to the GB and public is allowed active participation in GB and EC meetings because they are widely advertised. Not sure if currently helpful to the NEP.

Continue communicating on a regular basis with all its stakeholders as well as to encourage public involvement in the implementation of the CCMP.

- Engagement is strong among stakeholders via multiple media (social media, website, newsletter, etc).
- More transparency is occurring because documents (meeting agenda, minutes, reports, etc.) are publicly available and accessible.

Perceived Strengths

- Diverse partnership allowed for financial stability and sustainability. Also impressive is new partnership with LMU for greater collaboration.
- Scientific integrity is strong, driven by its wide array of research and monitoring projects in support of and in anticipation of greater effects from climate change. Staff participation in conferences to disseminate data as well as publication of results and accomplishments are critical for continued visibility and recognition of the program.
- SMBNEP is a leader in reducing trash in their watershed through implementation of marine debris TMDL and reduction of trash loadings (BMP Treatment Train Project, ReThink Disposable, ordinances to ban single-used plastic) as well as the leader in involving

communities in the implementation of the CCMP through financial assistance for multiple stormwater-related projects, trainings to reduce pollution by boats, and involving commercial sea urchin fishermen for restoring and reestablishing kelp forests.

Perceived Challenges

- Autonomy continues to be a barrier to communicating that SMBNEP is an independent NEP and not an arm of a state (SMBRC/A) or non-profit (TBF) or even an academic institution (LMU).
 - Clarifying specific roles and responsibilities (and updating MOU/MOA) are critical for setting the tone.
 - Governance structure of GB/EC need to be better articulated in terms of its overall contribution to the NEP versus a functioning state agency.
 - Updating by-laws, rules of engagement, succession planning, etc.
- Information is not centralized in one dedicated NEP website, though it is contained in SMBRC and TBF websites. It creates confusion as to what role each one plays in governance when information is decentralized.
 - Branding and logo are also unclear. Does the NEP use the TBF version of the logo or the SMBRC one? This is related to autonomy/independence piece.
- Consider conducting economic/environmental valuation of its resources, particularly since the NEP has made climate resilient investments over the years. This could further establish the NEP as a collective voice of all the communities/entities it represents and can add to its 'case statement' for potentially gaining more partners and funding.

Additional Documentation or Questions

- Missing 2 items from Assessment and Monitoring piece (p26, Performance Measure)
- Existing Finance and Monitoring Plan utilized during the review period?
- Is the CMP vetted through the TAC first before approved by the GB? (p29, Performance Measure)
- Was monitoring after the Arroyo Sequit Fish Passage project determined that this was a successful effort? (p41, Workplan Narrative)